

REMARKS

Claims 30-46 remain in the present application. Claims 30 and 38 are amended herein. Claim 46 is added herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicants respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 30-45

Claims 30-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0133848 to Hunt et al. (referred to herein as "Hunt"). Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 30-45 are not anticipated by Hunt for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 30 which recites a method of processing data using a portable electronic device comprising (emphasis added):

accessing first data comprising a web page;
transcoding, using a processor of said portable electronic device to execute code stored on said portable electronic device, said first data to generate second data; and
displaying, using a display device of said portable electronic device, said second data.

Independent Claim 38 recites elements similar to independent Claim 30. Claims 31-37 and 39-45 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further elements of the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submits that Hunt fails to teach or suggest the elements of “transcoding, using a processor of said portable electronic device to execute code stored on said portable electronic device, said first data to generate second data” as recited in independent Claim 30. As described in the present application, first data is transcoded to generate second data. The transcoding is performed using code stored on the portable electronic device. Support for the claim amendments can be found in, for example, lines 18-20 of page 7 of the instant application.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Hunt to teach tailoring content for use on a device using a browser *separate from* the device. For example, Hunt teaches that “[i]nformation content from the information source 102 is preferably retrieved and tailored for use on the electronic device 104 by a distributed browser 108” (paragraph 66) and also that the distributed browser 108 is separate from the electronic device 104 (Figure 1). As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Hunt teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching tailoring content for use on a device using a browser *separate from* the device instead of using code *stored on* the portable electronic device as claimed.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 30 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Hunt. Since independent Claim 38 recites elements similar to those discussed above with respect to independent

Claim 30, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 38 is also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Hunt. Since Claims 31-37 and 39-45 recite further elements of the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 31-37 and 39-45 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Hunt. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 30-45 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of record, and therefore, are allowable.

Claim 46

As discussed above, Applicants respectfully submits that Hunt fails to teach or suggest the elements of "transcoding, using a processor of said portable electronic device to execute code stored on said portable electronic device, said first data to generate second data" as recited in independent Claim 30. Since independent Claim 46 recites elements similar to those discussed above with respect to independent Claim 30, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 46 is also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Hunt. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 46 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 30-46 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 6 / 22 / 2010

/BMF/

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060